

In the Drawings

Replacement sheets of Figures 1-16 are enclosed herewith. Please make Figures 1-16 of record in this application and replace existing Figures 1-16 with the enclosed Figures.

Remarks

Claims 19, 21-23, 25-27, 30-31 and 33-37 are pending. Claims 19, 21, 22, 25, 26, 34 and 35 are amended. Claim 37 is new and replaces canceled Claim 29.

The Office Action provides that no drawings have been submitted. Figs. 1-16 were filed with the application and are shown in the published application. Nevertheless, a replacement set of Figs. 1-16 are enclosed for the Examiner's convenience to ensure that the drawings are of record in the application. Entry of the enclosed Figures into the official file is respectfully requested.

Claim 27 stands rejected under 35 USC 112, first paragraph, as allegedly containing subject matter that is not described in the specification in such a way as to enable one skilled in the art to which it pertains to make and/or use the invention. Reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

Paragraph [0077] of the specification has been amended to recite the subject matter of Claim 27. The Applicant respectfully submits that this amendment does not introduce new matter into the application because Claim 27, as originally-filed, contained the added subject matter. In addition, The Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter of Claim 27 is shown in Fig. 10, as originally-filed. In particular, Fig. 10 shows the width of the foot slightly decreasing at a portion beneath the disk 3 (i.e., moving upward from the bottom of the disk).

Claims 25-26 and 34 stand rejected under 35 USC 112, second paragraph as being indefinite. According to the rejection, Claims 25 and 26 are inconsistent with Claim 19 and Claim 34 is redundant of Claim 19. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the indefiniteness rejections is respectfully requested.

Claims 25 and 26 have been amended to refer to the *at least one stop* instead of at least one of the stops. The Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 25 and 26 are consistent with Claim 19, which recites at least one elastically deformable stop.

Further, Claim 25 has been amended to refer to "the slot" instead of "one of the slots." The Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 25 is consistent with Claim 19, which recites "a slot."

Finally, Claim 34 has been amended to remove the reference to the stop having a depth provided on a periphery of the cavity because this limitation is recited in Claim 19. The Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 34 is not redundant with Claim 19.

Claims 19, 21-23, 25-26, 30-31 and 33-35 stand rejected as being anticipated by Shindo. Claims 19, 21-22, 25-26, 30-31, 33 and 35 stand rejected as being anticipated by Kleine-Moellhoff. Claims 19, 21-23, 25-26, 30-31, 33 and 35 stand rejected as being anticipated by McCamy. Claim 36 stands rejected as unpatentable over Shindo, Kleine-Moellhoff and McCamy, further in view of Hoogland. In view of the amendments to Claim 19 (discussed below), the Applicant respectfully submits that these rejections are now moot.

Claim 29 stands rejected as being unpatentable over Shindo, Kleine-Moellhoff and McCamy, further in view of Spugios. The rejection states that Spugios discloses square relief openings (17) for easy removal of a record (the so-called prehension zones), and it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to combine Spugios with the aforementioned three (3) references to meet all of the elements of Claim 29.

Claim 19 has been amended to incorporate the subject matter of Claim 29. (Claim 29 has been canceled.) Therefore, Claim 19 now recites that the cylindrical cavity is prolonged from a side opposite one of the shoulders by a prehension zone forming a hollow portion emptying into the cavity. In addition, Claim 19 has been amended to add a window within the prehension zone, that allows a deeper engagement of a finger under the disk. Support for this amendment is found in Fig. 10 and paragraph [0076].

The Applicant respectfully submits that the combination of Shindo, Kleine-Moellhoff, McCamy and Spugios fails to disclose all of the elements of Claim 19. In particular, Spugios fails to disclose or suggest a window that allows a deeper engagement of a finger under the disk within its square relief openings. In addition, it would not have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Spugios because Spugios does not disclose that its relief openings are designed for deep insertion of fingers. In fact, Spugios' openings appear to allow a finger to fit under only the perimeter of a disk. For the foregoing reasons, the Applicant respectfully submits that Claim 19 is allowable and Claims 21-23, 25-27, 30-31 and 33-34 are allowable because they depend from Claim 19.

Further, new Claim 37 recites that a portion of the prehension zone extends into the cylindrical cavity. Support for this claim is found in at least Fig. 10. Because the prehension zone extends into the cavity, it allows a user to insert his or her fingers farther under the disk, which allows for easier removal. As shown in Spugios, the square relief openings do not extend into the so-called cavity but extend only to the perimeter of the cavity. Because these openings do not allow

a finger to be easily inserted under the disk, they do not allow for easy removal of the disk, as does the present invention.

In light of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that the entire application is now in condition for allowance, which is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



T. Daniel Christenbury
Reg. No. 31,750
Attorney for Applicant

TDC/vp
(215) 656-3381